REMARKS

In the Office Action issued on September 5, 2007, claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,420,993 to Varon. Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Varon in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,408,404 to Ladwig. Claims 10-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Ladwig in view of Varon.

Claims 1-14 are now pending in this application. Claims 1 and 10 were amended to clarify the subject matter that the applicant considers to be the invention.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

The Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention according to 1-14 do not fail to comply with the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. The Examiner states that the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification. More specifically, the Examiner states that the specification does not provide support for the limitations "determining an instruction type for each of a first natural language instruction and a second natural language instruction based on content within the first natural language instruction and the second natural language instruction, and extracting content from each of the first natural language instruction and the second natural language instruction. The Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 10 to remove subject matter which was not described in the specification. The Applicant provides support herein below for the subject

matter retained within claims 1 and 10.

The support for the limitation "determining an instruction type for each of a first natural language instruction and a second natural language instruction based on content within the first natural language instruction and the second natural language instruction" begins on page 4, line 7-10 of the specification, where the function of comparing orders and field reports against one another and other military databases is disclosed. On page 4, lines 26-29, of the specification it is disclosed that instructions can be provided in the form of orders and reports. On page 5, lines 7-14, of the specification it discloses that instructions are natural language instructions and can be converted from their natural language format to a position-based format. We then go to page 9, lines 23-29, of the specification where it discloses an input processor for receiving text messages, such as order and field reports. Accordingly, the input processor receives instructions that are in a natural language since a report/order includes an instruction that is in a natural language. On page 10, lines 1-3 of the specification it discloses that a type for a report that was received is determined. Since a report includes an instruction and an instruction is provided in a natural language determining a report type includes determining "an instruction type for a first natural language instruction first natural language instruction." Page 11, lines 1-5 as well as the aforementioned portions of the specification provide support for the subject matter "determining an instruction type for ... a second natural language instruction" recited in claims 1 and 10.

Support for the subject matter "extracting content from each of the first natural language instruction and the second natural language instruction" recited in claims 1 and 10 is found on page 10, lines 18-26, which discloses that an OPORD (i.e., an order) is cycled through and fragmentary orders are "pulled out." One having ordinary skill in the art would know the various techniques for pulling content out of a structure, such as an OPORD, including, but not limited

to, parsing the OPORD. The Applicant believes that the Examiner's rejection has been overcome and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

The Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention according to 1-14 are not indefinite because they fail to particularly point out and distinctly claim what the applicant regards as the invention as required by 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The Examiner states that the phrase "extracting content" is not understood by the Examiner. The Applicant believes that the phrase is clear and that one having ordinary skill in the art would know what is meant by the phrase. For convenience, the Applicant would like to direct the Examiner's attention to pages 10, lines 18-26 and page 11, lines 17-27 as examples of what is meant by "extracting content." The Applicant believes that the Examiner's rejection has been overcome and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8 and 10-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,420,993 to Varon. Varon discloses a technique for predicting conflict between maneuvering and non-maneuvering aircrafts. The system receives input including flight data plans designating a route and target signal corresponding to a signal transmitted from, or reflected off of, an aircraft. The system updates and maintains target signals to monitor the locations and speed of aircrafts and generates alerts to indicate that one or more targets are physically closer than allowed using the information received. The system uses the input flight data plans to "designate routes" or "compute a composite flight path" for the aircrafts and

predicts violations of separation standards based on a comparison of the "designated routes" or "composite flight path." See Varon col. 4, lines 23-30 and col. 5, lines 19-31.

In contrast, the present invention predict whether an alert should be issued because of conflicting natural language instructions. As now claims by claim 1, the present invention receives first and second natural language instructions. Varon fails to disclose the format of the flight data plans. Claim 1, as amended, now recites extracting content from at least one of the first and second natural language instructions and determining if execution of the first natural language instruction complies with the intent of a user issuing the first natural language instruction prior to the execution of the first natural language instruction based in part on a comparison of the content extracted from each of the first natural language instruction and the second natural language instruction, and issuing an alert if the execution of the first natural language instruction creates the potential conflict. There is no disclosure in Varon of extracting content from entered data flight plans or target signals. There is also no disclosure in Varon of comparing any portion of the data flight plans for the respective aircrafts. There is only disclosure that "a composite flight plan is computed and that violations of separation standards are predicted." See Varon col. 5, lines 19-31. Varon fails to teach or suggest the above-identified limitations. Accordingly, claim 1 of the present invention is not unpatentable over Varon.

Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and thus are not unpatentable over Varon for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention according to 9 is not unpatentable over Varon in view of Ladwig.

Ladwig does not cure the deficiencies of Varon. Ladwig teaches a system that sends and

receives signals that include digital data streams and messages. The messages and data streams are retrieved by agents from a database that stores information received from various sources about events that have happened. See Ladwig col. 5, lines 35-37; col. 5, lines 53-55; col. 5, line 59-col. 6, line 5. The data streams are sorted using rules base. In addition to failing to cure the deficiencies of Varon, Ladwig fails to disclose periodically retrieving and processing content extracted from the first natural language instruction and second natural language instruction. There is no disclosure in Ladwig of extracting content from the data streams or messages for execution as an instruction. The messages and data streams merely include data about past events and are not instructions that are for execution in the future. The combination of Varon and Ladwig fails to teach or suggest the above-identified limitations of claim 1 as well as the identified limitations in claim 9. Accordingly, claim 9 of the present invention is not unpatentable over Varon in view of Ladwig.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention according to 10 is not unpatentable over Ladwig in view Varon for the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Additional Fees:

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 50-4047 (25389.0009).

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, all of the Examiner's rejections to the claims are believed to be overcome. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all the claims remaining in the application. Should the Examiner feel further communication would facilitate prosecution, he is urged to call the undersigned at the phone number provided below.

Date: December 17, 2007

Chadwick A. Jackson, Reg. No. 46,495
Attorney for Applicants
Bingham McCutchen LLP
2020 K Street, NW
Intellectual Property Law Department
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 373-6661